

# 7

## Na Dubbhiya Sutta

The “Do not harm” Discourse | S 11.7  
Theme: Not harming even our enemies  
Translated & annotated by Piya Tan ©2019

### 1 Summary and highlights

**1.1 SUTTA SUMMARY.** The **Na Dubbhiya Sutta** (S 11.7) relates how once Sakra resolves never to harm anyone, even his enemy. Vepa,citti (Sakra sworn enemy) reads Sakra’s mind, and approaches him (we are not told of his intent in doing so). As soon as Sakra sees Vepa,citti, he is caught but reminds Sakra not to go back on his word (that is, not to harm even an enemy). Sakra then makes him swear that he (Vepa,-citti) will never harm him. Vepa,citti promises by way of an act of truth (*sacca,kiriyā*)<sup>1</sup> [893\*-895\*].

#### 1.2 VEPA,CITTI’S ACTIONS

##### 1.2.1 His intention

**1.2.1.1** From the Sutta, we know that Vepa,citti has the power of mind-reading. From this mention of Vepa,citti’s mind-reading power alone, however, we cannot surmise that all asuras have it. However, it should also be remembered that Vepa,citti and the asuras are erstwhile devas.<sup>2</sup> As such, it is often natural that they have such an ability.

**1.2.1.2** We are not told of Vepa,citti’s exact intention in rushing **to meet Sakra** as soon as he learns of the latter’s vow of non-violence [1.1]. There is no mention of any ill-intent on Vepa,citti’s part. The Sutta only expresses Sakra’s consternation, perhaps a reflex, on account of the sudden appearance of an old sworn enemy.

In the last line of the closing couplet [895b\*], Vepa,citti addresses Sakra as **Sujam,pati** (literally, “Sujā’s lord), that is, “Sujā’s husband.” **Sujā** is Vepa,citti’s daughter and the most beautiful of the asura women. Through past-life connection, they continue to love one another even in this life, and elope in a dramatic manner. [§895b\*]

##### 1.2.2 Likely situation

**1.2.2.1** From the Sutta [§3], we learn that Vepa,citti, upon learning of Sakra’s vow of non-violence, visits the latter alone. There is no mention of Vepa,citti’s having with him any army or even bodyguards. The point of the Sutta narrative is clearly that this is a man-to-man or rather a deva-to-asura meeting.

**1.2.2.2** The Saṃyutta Commentary tells us that as soon as Sakra says, “Stop, Vepa,citti, you’re caught!” it is as if he were bound feet, hands and neck (the fivefold bond) (SA 1:344 f). Vepa,citti then, almost helplessly cries out, reminding Sakra:

<sup>1</sup> SD 39.2 (2).

<sup>2</sup> On the asuras being thrown out of Tāvātimsa by Sakra, see SD 15.5 (3.7.1); SD 39.2 (1).

“Sir, do not abandon the thought that has just occurred to you!” [§5]. Clearly, Vepa,citti, has come in peace, but Sakra does not trust him, or perhaps fears him: he is not only his sworn enemy but Sakra has also stolen his daughter right before the asura-gathering where she is to choose her husband!<sup>3</sup>

### **1.2.3 A problematic sentence**

**1.2.3.1** The sentence, “**Sir, do not abandon the thought that has just occurred to you!**” (*Yad eva te mārisa pubbe cittaṃ, tad eva tvaṃ mā pajahāsīti*), spoken by Vepa,citti, is textually problematic. Here, I follow the Burmese (Be) reading. The Pali Text Society (European = Ee) reading, in place of *mā pajahāsī*, has *mā pahāsī*, which gives the same meaning. Hence, Be and Ee are in agreement.

However, the Cambodian (Khmer = Ke), Sinhalese, Siamese (Mahāchula edition, Se:MC) and PTS Saṃyutta new (Ee2) editions read *tad eva tvaṃ mārisa pahāsīti*, while the Siamese Syāmrath (Royal edition = SR) reads *tad eva tvaṃ mārisa jahāsīti*—both omitting the prohibitive *mā* (“do not”). This seems to be the majority reading.

Now, if we follow the majority reading, then §5 would read “**Sir, abandon the thought that has just occurred to you!**” Vepa,citti is telling Sakra *not* to be kind to his enemies, that is, as it were, to keep the status quo, and that they should go on battling one another. But to do this would be foolish on Vepa,citti’s part since he has come alone and in a hostile manner.

And the fact that he has been “caught,” bound, as it were, with the fivefold bonds does not help. This may simply be a dramatic way of saying that some of the Tāvatiṃsa devas have already caught Vepa,citti, who has stolen into Tāvatiṃsa all alone, and he is now helpless.

**1.2.3.2** Furthermore, Vepa,citti, in his “**act of truth**” [§§7-9], swears that no one should harm Sakra without facing the karmic consequences, the significance of which we will examine below [2]. What is very significant is that Vepa,citti, in the last line of his verses, addresses Sakra as **Sujam,pati**, “husband of Sujā.”

Although we can imagine, Vepa,citti, being angry and sarcastic—mocking Sakra as “Sujam,pati”—it fits the whole narrative context better to take the Sutta reading as it is. We can see this as Vepa,citti’s actual acceptance of Sakra as his son-in-law. This is an account of the truce, even reconciliation, between the asuras and the devas.

**1.2.3.3** We are reminded here of a royal pair, an uncle and his nephew, battling one another—that is, **king Pasenadi and his nephew, Ajāta,sattu**. Pasenadi was deeply upset with Ajātasattu’s parricide. He had killed his own father, Pasenadi’s brother-in-law, Bimbisāra,<sup>4</sup> as a result of which his chief queen, Kosala,devī (Pasenadi’s sister), died out of love for her late husband.

Now, Pasenadi’s father, Mahā,kosala had given as “bath-money” (dowry) (*nahāna,mūla*) the rich village of Kāsī, whose revenues Ajāta,sattu continued to enjoy even after his parents’ death. Pasenadi, feeling that Ajāta,sattu was unworthy of this, fought a series of battles with his nephew to punish him.<sup>5</sup>

Two such battles are recorded in the Saṃyutta Nikāya—the **Saṅgāma Sutta 1** (S 3.14) and the **Saṅgāma Sutta 2** (S 3.15). The Saṅgāma Sutta 1 records how Pasenadi at first<sup>6</sup> loses the battle to his nephew, Ajāta,sattu. The Saṅgāma Sutta 2 records, that, in due course, Pasenadi finally defeats Ajāta,sattu, seizes

<sup>3</sup> On Sakra and Sujā, see SD SD 54.6 (3.2.1.3(2)).

<sup>4</sup> Bimbisāra’s chief queen was Kosala,devī, daughter of Mahā Kosala, and sister of Pasenadi (SA 1:154; DPPN: Bimbisāra).

<sup>5</sup> See Intro to **Harita,mātā J** (J 239/2:237 f).

<sup>6</sup> **Saṅgāma S 1** (S 3.14/1:82 f) states that Ajāta,sattu defeats Pasenadi, who retreats to his capital.

his army but spares his life.<sup>7</sup> He imprisons Ajāta,sattu, but frees him when he agrees to renounce the throne. Pasenadi then gives his own daughter, Vajirā, in marriage to Ajāta,sattu.<sup>8</sup>

The point of this account is that Pasenadi and Ajāta,sattu—like Vepa,citti and Sakra—reconciled through marriage as father-in and son-in-law respectively. In such matters of power and relationships, it seems that the gods are only human, too.

## 2 The 4 great evils

**2.0** When Vepa,citti is caught by Sakra, he makes Vepa,citti swear never to harm him (Sakra), Vepa,citti utters the Sutta’s only set of 3 couplet [893\*-895\*], which are an act of truth [1.1]. The Commentary explains that the first 2 couplet [893\* 894\*] refer to the 4 great evils (*mahā,pāpa*) of the present aeon [2.5.1.3]:

<u>the great evil of</u>	<u>like the evil of</u>
(1) “the speaker of lies”	the king of Ceti, the 1 <sup>st</sup> liar of the present aeon: Cetiya Jataka (J 422);
(2) “the reviler of noble ones”	Kokalika (see S 6.10);
(3) “the betrayer of friends”	the betrayer of the Bodhisattva in the Mahākapi Jātaka (J 516);
(4) “the ungrateful”	Devadatta.

**2.1 “THE SPEAKER OF LIES”** (*musā bhaṇato*) refers to a mythical king of Ceti in the “first age” (*paṭhama kappā*),<sup>9</sup> as recorded in **the Cetiya Jātaka** (J 422) on how he spoke the first lie in the world during this aeon. His name is Upacara or Apacara, king of Ceti. On account of his persistent lies (a total of 7 times), he sank into the earth and was swallowed into Avīci hell. The story is related in reference to Devadatta (king Apacara in that past life) being swallowed up by the earth even in our time. Devadatta, too, was king Ceti in that Jātaka. (J 3:454-461; Miln 202)

### **2.2 “THE REVILER OF NOBLE ONES”** (*ariyūpavādino*)

**2.2.1 Kokālika Sutta 2** (S 6.10 ≈ Sn 3.10). **The “reviler of noble one”** refers to the monk Kokalika,<sup>10</sup> the main accomplice of Deva,datta, or even the mastermind behind him as schismatics.<sup>11</sup> **The Kokālika Sutta** shows Kokālika to be a monk of volatile temper, and does not hesitate to revile the 2 chief disciples despite his being admonished by the Buddha on their virtue<sup>12</sup> [2.2.2].

It is said that thrice he falsely accused the chief disciples of bad desires. Just as he left Jeta,vana, in a huff of anger, boils broke out on his body, dwelling and bursting. Groaning in pain, he fell at the gates of Jeta,vana. Brahmā Tudu, his erstwhile preceptor, hearing his cries, appeared to him, beseeching him to seek forgiveness from the elders. Defiant, he cursed the brahma. He died in pain and arose in Paduma (Lotus) hell.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>7</sup> In **Saṅgāma S 2** (S 3.25/1:84 f), Pasenadi defeats and captures Ajāta,sattu.

<sup>8</sup> See SD 8.10 (1).

<sup>9</sup> *Paṭhama kappā* here refers to the earliest period of human civilization in prehistory, ie, before recorded history or in mythical times.

<sup>10</sup> On the possibility of 2 persons named Kokālika at that time, see DPPN sv.

<sup>11</sup> See SD 46.19 (2.3.-2.4).

<sup>12</sup> S 6.10/1:149-153 (SD 71.16b).

<sup>13</sup> **Brahmā Tudu S** (S 6.9/1:149), SD 71.17; **Kokālika S 2** (S 6.10/1:149-153), SD 71.16b (SA 1:216-219); **(Dasaka) Kokālika S** (A 10.89/5:170-174), SD 71.18 (AA 5:56-62); **Kokāliya S** (Sn 3.10/123-131), SD 17.19 (SnA 2:473 f); **Tak-kariya J** (J 481/4:242-255); **Kokālika Vatthu** (DhA 4:91-93).

**2.2.2 The Kokāliya Sutta** (Sn 3.10 ≈ S 6.10)<sup>14</sup> is a close parallel to the Kokālika Sutta [2.2.1] but gives his name as Kokāliya. Both have identical prose, but Sn 661-678 (Sn 3.10) gives details of the hellish torments not found in S 6.10. **Sn 662**, referring to the monk Kokāliya's abusive and false accusation of Sāriputta and Moggallāna is well known and recurs in a number of suttas and quoted in the Commentaries.<sup>15</sup> Sn 662 runs as follows:

*yo appaduṭṭhassa narassa dussati  
suddhassa posassa anaṅgaṇassa  
tam eva bālaṃ pacceṭi pāpaṃ  
sukhumo rajo paṭivātaṃ va khitto*

Whoever offends against an unoffending man  
a pure person, blemish-free,  
the bad returns to that self-same fool,  
line fine dust thrown against the wind.

(Sn 662 = S 544\* = 623\* = Dh 125 = J 3:203)

**2.2.3 The (Dasaka) Kokālika Sutta** (A 10.89)<sup>16</sup> combines **the Brahmā Tudu Sutta** (S 6.9)<sup>17</sup> and **the Kokālika Sutta** (S 6.10).<sup>18</sup> Hence, parts of A 10.89 also overlap with those of **the Kokāliya Sutta** (Sn 3.10).<sup>19</sup>

**2.2.4 The Takkāriya Jātaka (J 480) introduction** relates how Kokālika once blames the chief disciples for the laity of village not supporting him with offerings and reacting to it with animosity.<sup>20</sup> The story refers to **the Kokālika Sutta** (S 6.10 = Sn 3.10) [2.2.1].

**2.2.5 The Kokālika Vatthu** (DhA 25.3), the story of Kokālika, centering on Dh 363 relates, in some detail, the background to Kokālika's animosity towards the 2 chief disciples.<sup>21</sup> This Dhammapada story contains the popular story of "the talkative tortoise," that is, Kokālika in a past life. Two geese agreed to bite each end of the stick with the tortoise biting its middle, and provided that the tortoise did not speak a word while flying; but he did! (DhA 25.3a).<sup>22</sup>

**2.3 "THE BETRAYER OF FRIENDSHIP"** (*mittadduno*) refers to **the Mahā,kapi Jātaka** (J 516) which is related by the Buddha after Devadatta tries to kill him by hurling a rock from above him, as related in the Vinaya.<sup>23</sup>

The Bodhisattva was once a monkey in a forest. One day, he came across a man looking for his oxen, who had fallen into a pit and had lain there starving for ten days. The Bodhisattva pulled him out and lay down to rest. However, the man, very hungry, and wishing to eat him, struck his head with a stone, grievously wounding him.

<sup>14</sup> Sn 3.10/658\*-678\*/123-131 (SD 71.16b).

<sup>15</sup> **Phusati S** (S 54\*/1:13); **Bilaṅgika S** (S 623\*/1:164); **Dh 125**; **J 3:203**; **DhA 3:33**; **PvA 116**. This story is found in **Kokālika S** (S 6.10) [2.2.1] but without the verse. A different but more violent background story is found in **Koka Sunakha, luddaka Vatthu** (DhA 9.9/3:31-33) on **Dh 125** (see DhA:B 2:282-284). On the karmic fruits of harming the innocent, see Dh 137-140.

<sup>16</sup> A 10.89/5:170-174 (SD 71.18).

<sup>17</sup> S 6.9/1:149 (SD 71.17).

<sup>18</sup> S 6.10/1:149 -153 = Sn 3.10 (SD 71.16b).

<sup>19</sup> Sn 3.10/658\*-678\*/123-131 (SD 71.16b).

<sup>20</sup> Intro, J 481/4:242,27-245,16.

<sup>21</sup> DhA 25.3/4:91-93. This account refers to **Kokālika S** (S 6.10 = Sn 3.10).

<sup>22</sup> DhA 25.3a, derive from J 215/2:175-173. DhA 4:91,15-92,8 = J 2:176,2-18. On the story's motif, see M Bloomfield, *Journal of the American Oriental Soc*, 36 1917:60:

<https://archive.org/details/journalofamerica36ameruoft/page/n7>.

<sup>23</sup> The full story given at V 2:184-203 (for tr, see Ñānamoli, *Life of the Buddha*, 1992: 261 f). See also background story of **Sakalika S 2** (S 4.13/4:110 f), SD 61.7.

The monkey at once fled up a tree. Realising that the man would be unable to find his way out of the forest, in spite of his intense pain, he swung from tree to tree, showing him the way out. The man became a leper and wandered about for seven years until he came to the Migācira Park in Benares, where he told his story to the king. At the end of his account, the earth opened and swallowed up him into Avīci hell.

The monkey was the Bodhisattva and the ungrateful leper was Devadatta in that life.<sup>24</sup>

## 2.4 “THE UNGRATEFUL” (*akataññuno*)

**2.4.1 Deva,datta.** The term, “the ungrateful” refers to **Devadatta**,<sup>25</sup> the Buddha’s cousin, also a monk, who is said to harbour ambitions of taking over leadership of the sangha from the aged Buddha. In this case, he is held up by the Commentary as the worst case of an ungrateful person: the Buddha has done so much good to and for Devadatta, but he neither acknowledges them nor rejoices in them.<sup>26</sup>

### 2.4.2 in what ways is Devadatta ungrateful?

**2.4.2.1** Firstly, Devadatta is disrespectful and ungrateful to **the Buddha**, the fully self-awakened. He is close to the Buddha both in blood (as a cousin) and in spirit (as a monk), but he neither acknowledges the Buddha as a unique being nor does he rejoice in his presence amongst us. He sees the Buddha in power mode—as an “aged leader” of a group who should step down, and that he should take over the reins of power over the sangha. In a sense, it seems that he thinks that as a Sakya noble and the Buddha’s cousin, he has the right to take over the Buddha’s “position.” This is Devadatta’s ingratitude to the Buddha.

**2.4.2.2** Secondly, the Buddha has taught that it is **the Dharma**, the truth and teaching, which is above us all, even the Buddha himself, as our true and only refuge—meaning that, it is the Dharma that makes the Buddha. Furthermore, it is only when we understand the Dharma and accept it that we truly are “Buddhist” or Dharma-spirited, that is, ready to step on the path of awakening.

In other words, the Buddha Dharma is our teacher; hence, even with the Buddha’s passing, the true teacher of truth is still with us. A human teacher may guide us to some extent, but the reality is that we are always on our own since we have to know our own mind, tame it and free it. Hence, the Buddha declares that he does not “lead” the sangha or any of us—the Dharma is our guide and refuge.<sup>27</sup> In attempting to take over the Buddha’s place, Devadatta shows his ingratitude to the Dharma.

**2.4.2.3 The Gopaka Moggallāna Sutta** (M 108) states that the sangha is guided and empowered by the Dharma, not a leader or person. In this sense, the sangha is self-regulating, and does not need an individual leader. A human leader must or need to assume the “power mode.”<sup>28</sup> The Dharma, on the

<sup>24</sup> J 516/5:67-74; cf *Jātaka,mālā* no 24. The story is also called the Vevatiya,kapi J. Another story similar to J 516 is **Cūḷa,nandiyā J** (J 222/2:199-202), told by the Buddha in connection with Devadatta’s efforts to kill the Buddha: first, pushing down a rock from a cliff above the Buddha, then sending out a fierce elephant Nālāgiri to crush the Buddha on a narrow street (Cv 7.3.11 f); Miln 4.4.44; cf **Kuruṅga J** (J 21) intro, where it is called Dhana,pālaka (J 1:173).

<sup>25</sup> SD 71.4; SD 34.6 (2).

<sup>26</sup> Based on the twin teachings of gratefulness as acknowledging a good turn (*kata-ñ,ñū*) and rejoicing in it (*kata,-vedī*): see **Kataññū Kata,vedī S** (A 2.11.2), SD 3.1(1.4.4).

<sup>27</sup> See **Gāraṇa S** (S 6.2) = **Uruvelā S 1** (A 4.21), SD 12.3.

<sup>28</sup> M 108/3:7-15 (SD 33.5).

other hand, is living in the “truth mode.” Seeking the truth (true reality embodied in the 4 noble truths) and living free on account of understanding those truths—this is the sangha spirit.

Hence, the sangha of Dharma practitioners is guided by moral shame and moral fear (*hiri,ottappa*).<sup>29</sup> Simply, moral shame is the due respect for one another, and moral fear is the respect for the Dharma. Guided by these twin world protectors, the Buddha, sangha elders and monastic seniors take care of other sangha members<sup>30</sup> in the “love mode.”<sup>31</sup> Devadatta neither understood this vital nature of the Dharma nor did he joyfully accept it if he did. This is Devadatta’s ingratitude to the sangha.

**2.4.2.4** Finally, while many of the sangha members are **saints** (*ariya*)—streamwinners, once-returners, non-returners and arhats—Devadatta was none of these. He was still an ordinary worldlyling (*puthuj-jana*), an outsider (*bāhira*) to the path. He should be focusing on his training in the Dharma-Vinaya rather than having ambitions to lead a community that need no such leading. By seeking a position of power, Devadatta is going the opposite direction of the very spirit of the sangha—renunciation: the letting go of power, of the world. In this sense, Devadatta is ungrateful to the training (*sikkhā*), which has brought him thus far, but he has stopped dead by turning his mind away from it.

## 2.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF VEPA,CITTI’S VERSES

### 2.5.1 Act of truth

**2.5.1.1** What does Vepa,citti mean by his “act of truth”? [1.1 n]. What is the significance of the closing verses [893\*-895\*]? These are two ways of asking the same question, which we will try to answer here. The background to this is that Sakra aspires not to harm even his enemies [§2]. Vepa,citti, learning of this, approaches Sakra [§3]. Sakra is suspicious of Vepa,citti, who then reminds Sakra not to abandon his noble aspiration [§4]. Sakra asks Vepa,citti for an assurance that he (Vepa,citti) will never harm him [§5], to which Vepa,citti responds with his act of truth [§§893\* = 895\*].

**2.5.1.2** An **act of truth** (*sacca,kiriya*) is an aspiration, a promise or a statement that something will come to pass (usually something good), or will not (when it benefits either or both parties), based on a truth. However, an act of truth can also work like a curse by an aggrieved party against a more powerful aggressor or some overwhelming odds.

**The Isayo Samuddaka** (S 11.10) records how some seers, dwelling by the sea, fear that the asura led by Vepa,citti (then called Sambara) will destroy their lodgings, when they battle the devas. When Sambara refuses, the seers are forced to such a curse, on account of which Sambara’s mind “trembles with fear” (*cittam vepati*) even as he sleeps. Hence, he is called Vepa,citti.<sup>32</sup>

**2.5.1.3** Vepa,citti, in his **act of truth**, invokes the power of 4 terrible truths, that is, the 4 “great evils” (*mahā,pāpa*) in our times (this world-period or this Buddha-period). Apparently, these are the first occurrences of these terrible evils or bads in our times (*imasmim kappe paṭhama,kappikesu*),<sup>33</sup> that is to say:

<sup>29</sup> See **Moral shame and moral fear**, SD 2.5.

<sup>30</sup> On the Buddha and elders looking after other monastics, see **Cātumā S** (M 67,13/1:459), SD 34.7.

<sup>31</sup> On “milk and water” sangha fellowship, see **Dhamma,cetiya S** (M 89,11), SD 64.10; **(Anuruddha) Upakkilesa S** (M 128,11), SD 5.18.

<sup>32</sup> S 11.10/1:227 (SD 39.2).

<sup>33</sup> We should take “period” (*kappa*) here to mean a “buddha-period” (*buddh’antara* or *buddha,kāla*) since we have 5 buddhas in this world-cycle. That of Gotama is the 4<sup>th</sup> buddha-period. See SD 36.2 (3.1.2).

- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| (1) The 1 <sup>st</sup> lie, spoken by the king of Ceti;                          | [2.1] |
| (2) The 1 <sup>st</sup> reviler of noble ones, that is, Kokālika;                 | [2.2] |
| (3) The 1 <sup>st</sup> betrayer of friends, an ungrateful man saved by a monkey; | [2.3] |
| (4) The 1 <sup>st</sup> ingrate of the teaching, that is, Deva,datta.             | [2.4] |

It's interesting to note that all these 4 accounts are related to **Deva,datta** and his accomplice, **Kokāliya**. While **Māra** represents all the worst bad or most evil psychologically, then, **Devadatta** represents the most unwholesome in us in relation to *others*: as a couple, or as members of a group, a community, a country, a culture, a race—the socially worst in us. The stories of Devadatta's actions are lessons in neither measuring nor exploiting others—measuring and exploiting others are, in fact, a patent psychological trait in the asuras.

**2.5.2 Reconciliation?** Basically, Vepa,citti, in his act of truth is declaring that if he should betray Sakra, his own son-in-law, the husband of Sujā, his own daughter [§895b\*], may he suffer the same karmic fates of the 1<sup>st</sup> liar, king Apacara of Ceti [2.1], of the reviler of noble ones, Kokālika [2.2], of the ungrateful cowherd who tries to kill his own helper, the monkey [2.3], and of the ingrate Devadatta [2.4].

Vepa,citti's dramatic act of truth has great significance. It is not merely dramatic, but is an instructive way by which Vepa,citti is declaring that (1) he is telling the truth, (2) he is not angry with Sakra, (3) he will never betray him, and (4) he is grateful that their mutual animosity finally ends here.

— — —

## Na Dubbhiya Sutta

### The “Do not Harm” Discourse

S 11.7

1 At Sāvathī.

#### Sakra's aspiration to non-violence

2 “Once upon a time, bhikshus, while Sakra, the lord of the devas, was alone in solitude, this thought arose in him:

‘Whoever may be my sworn enemy, I should not harm him!’<sup>34</sup>

#### Vepa,citti meets Sakra

3 Then, bhikshus, Vepa,citti, the lord of the asuras, having known with his own mind the reflection in the mind of Sakra, the lord of the devas, approached him.

4 Sakra, the lord of the devas, bhikshus, seeing Vepa,citti, the lord of the asuras, coming from afar, said: ‘Stop, Vepa,citti, you're caught!’<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> *Yo'pi me assa supaccatthiko\* tassa'pāham na dubbheyyan'ti.* \*Only Be supaccatthiko; all other readings: *pac-cathiko*.

5 ‘Sir, do not abandon the thought that has just occurred to you!’<sup>36</sup>

6 ‘Swear, Vepa,citti, that you won’t harm me!’<sup>37</sup>

### Vepa,citti’s act of truth<sup>38</sup>

7	<i>Yaṃ musā bhaṇato pāpaṃ yaṃ pāpaṃ ariyûpavādino</i>	(893)	The bad that comes to the speaker of lies, <sup>39</sup> the bad that comes to the reviler of the noble ones,
8 <sup>40</sup>	<i>mittadduno ca yaṃ pāpaṃ yaṃ pāpaṃ akatañño</i>	(894)	the bad that comes to the betrayers of friends, the bad that comes to the ungrateful—
9	<i>tam eva pāpaṃ phusati<sup>41</sup> yo te dubbhe sujampatī</i>	(895)	may that very same bad touch [return to] whomever tries to harm <sup>42</sup> you, Sujam,pati! <sup>43</sup>

— evaṃ —

190203 190206 190609

<sup>35</sup> *Tiṭṭha vepa,citti gahitosīti*. Comy: As soon as Sakra says this, Vepa,citti is as if bound feet, hands and neck (SA 1:344 f).

<sup>36</sup> *Yad eva te mārisa pubbe cittaṃ, tad eva tvaṃ mā pajahāsīti*. \* *Be tad eva tvaṃ mā pajahāsīti*; Ee *tad eva tvaṃ mā pajahāsīti*; Ce Ee2 Ke Se:MC *tad eva tvaṃ mārisa pajahāsīti*; Se:SR *tad eva tvaṃ mārisa jahāsīti*. Both Be & Ee readings are effectively the same, which I follow. The other readings give the opposite sense. See (1.2.3).

<sup>37</sup> *Sapassu ca me vepa,citti adubbhāyāti*.

<sup>38</sup> On the “act of truth” (*sacca,kiriya*), see (1.1) n.

<sup>39</sup> 893\*+894\*, says Comy, refer to the 4 great evils (*mahā.pāpāni*) of our cosmic time: see (2).

<sup>40</sup> This and the foll running nos are not found in Ee.

<sup>41</sup> Be Se *phusatu*; Ce Ee *phusati*.

<sup>42</sup> “Tries to harm” (*dubbhe*: V 2:203 = It 86) adj from *dubbhati*, “to injure, harm, deceive; to be hostile (towards)”. Comys on *dubbhe*: *dubbho*, “who (tries to) harm” (at V 2:203); *dusseyya*, “who would harm” (at It 86).

<sup>43</sup> *Sujam,pati* (lit, “Sujā’s lord,” one of Sakra’s many names) means “husband of Sujā,” Verocana’s daughter. On Sakra’s many names, see (S 11.12/1:229 f), SD 54.19. On Sakra and Sujā, see SD 54.6 (3.2.1.3(2)).